

Appl. No. 09/851,999
Amdt. dated April , 2004
Reply to Office Action of February 2, 2003

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, claims 9, 11 and 12 were objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. It is noted that claim 9 is already in independent form and accordingly, is believed to be allowed.

Claims 2 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over the recoil device in prior art Figure 5 in view of Ida et al (4,978,864) and further in view of Gotoh (4,491,754) on the grounds set forth in the Office Action.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over prior art Figure 5 in view of Ida et al and Gotoh as applied to claims 2 and 10, and further in view of Haynes (US Patent No.4,757,710) for the reasons stated in the Office Action.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over prior art Figure 5 in view of Ida et al, and Gotoh as applied to claims 2 and 10, and further in view of Ide (US Patent No.4,038,051) on the grounds set forth in the Office Action.

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over prior art Figure 5 in view of Ida et al Gotoh as applied to claims 2 and 10, and further in view of Ide for the reasons stated in the Office Action.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over prior art Figure 5 in view of Ida et al Gotoh and Haynes as

applied to claim 3, and further in view of Ide on the grounds set forth in the Office Action.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over prior art Figure 5 in view of Ida et al, Gotoh and Haynes as applied to claim 4, and further in view of Ide for the reasons stated in the Office Action.

In response to the Office Action, claims 2-8 and 10 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter therein, and claims 11 and 12 are rewritten in independent form so as to secure their allowance. Accordingly claims 9, 11 and 12 are allowable.

In the event there are further issues remaining in any respect the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone attorney to reach agreement to expedite issuance of this application.

Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Since the present claims set forth the present invention patentably and distinctly, and are not taught by the cited art either taken alone or in combination, this amendment is believed to place this case in condition for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the matter, enter this amendment, and to allow all of the claims in this case.

Respectfully submitted
Fusao Tachibana

by: _____

MARTIN A. FARBER
Attorney for Applicant
Registered Representative
Registration No.: 22,345

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that the accompanying Amendment is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 12, 2004.
Dated: April 12, 2004

Martin A. Farber

866 United Nations Plaza
New York, NY 10017-1872
(212) 758-2878